

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/469,987	12/21/1999	MARK L. SKARPNESS	10559/094001	5632
8791	7590 10/26/2005		EXAMINER	
	Y SOKOLOFF TAYLO	NGUYEN, PHUONGCHAU BA		
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ELES, CA 90025-1030	2665		
			DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	09/469,987	SKARPNESS, MARK L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Phuongchau Ba Nguyen	2665			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 bd will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: tute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed iii) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9-5	9-5.				
· ·	his action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 20-23 and 32-39 is/are pending in the same states of the above claim(s) 24-31 is/are withdrest of the same states of the sa	rawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	ccepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	, ,,,	•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been received in Receive	lication No ceived in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified copies not red	ceived.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		mary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9-9-5</u>. 		lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/469,987 Page 2

Art Unit: 2665

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 20, 22, 32, 36-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eames (6,208,637) in view of Roger (6,346,964).

 Regarding claims 20, 32, 36-39:

Eames (6,208,637) discloses a telephony over broadband telephony adapter (combined data and telephony 1604, fig.16b); comprising:

- a device controller (1622, fig.16b) to couple to a host controller (1700) of a broadband modem (ADSL modem 1600, fig.17);
 - a modulator (code 1640, fig.16b) to modulate telephony information;
- a transcoder (1638, fig.16b) to transcode information between said device controller and said modulator; and

Application/Control Number: 09/469,987

Art Unit: 2665

one or more subscriber line interface circuits (SLIC 1640, fig.16b) to couple one or more telephony devices (to telephone via RJ11) to said modulator; and

a memory device (flash 1634-fig.16b) which connected to the device controller (1622);

an expansion port (twisted pair drop cable 180-fig.16b) to include a signal to carry information (of devices connecting to the second adapter via the other USAM 340-fig.3) not associated with the one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter (the first adapter 1604, fig.16b) to a second broadband telephony adapter (the second adapter, not shown, that could connect to the other USAM 340-fig.3)

wherein the one or more telephony devices are able to communicate over a broadband line (180, figs.16) via the broadband modem (1602) by communicating via the host controller (1700) of the broadband modem (1600).

Eames does not explicitly (1) a memory device (flash 1634-fig.16b) to store one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter, wherein the device controller (1622) separates information

associated with the one or more telephone numbers, and wherein the one or more telephone numbers are associated with the one or more telephony devices; (2) wherein a new telephone number maybe added to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter by programming the new telephone number into the memory device; (3) wherein the separated information associated with the one or more telephone numbers is forwarded to the one or more telephony devices associated with the one or more telephone numbers.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Roger (6,346,964) discloses in figure 2 "telephone numbers associated with each party can be stored in a memory associated with controller 257-fig.2 for reference. A displayable address book can be provided to store names, addresses and other information such as a digitized bitmap image of each user," (corresponding to (1-3)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to provide high quality audio, data and video teleconferencing between two or more telephone users in an office connected through a telephone switch such as PBX.

Regarding claim 22:

Eames further comprises an expansion hub (BDT 130, fig.3) to connect additional devices (in the new network, i.e., ATM network) to the host controller via the expansion hub.

3. Claims 21, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eames (6,208,637) in view of Roger (6,346,964) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Barzegar (6,347,075).

Regarding claims 21, 34:

Eames does not explicitly disclose wherein said device controller (1622, fig.16b) is configured to operate in compliance with one of a Universal Serial Bus standard, a Firewire standard, and a wireless communication standard. However, in the same field of endeavor, Barzegar (6,347,075) discloses in figure 2 IEEE 1394 112 (firewire). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply Barzegar's teaching to Eames' system with the motivation being to allow incorporating the desired processing digital data onto the data network.

4. Claims 23, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eames (6,208,637) in view of Roger (6,346,964) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Bauer (6.061,450).

Regarding claims 23, 35:

Eames does not explicitly disclose wherein the telephony device is able to communicate via the host controller of the broadband modem via wireless transmission between the telephony device and the broadband telephony adapter. However, in the same field of endeavor, Bauer (6.061,450) discloses wherein the telephony device is able to communicate via the host controller of the broadband modem via wireless transmission between the telephony device and the broadband telephony adapter (figure 5, 202, 507). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply Bauer's teaching to Eames' system with the motivation being to pro

5. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eames (6,208,637) in view of Roger (6,346,964) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Bhatia (6,118,768).

Application/Control Number: 09/469,987 Page 7

Art Unit: 2665

Regarding claim 33:

Eames discloses wherein the telephony adapter (1604, fig.16b) has a telephone number associated therewith (inherent with the telephone, fig.16b).

Eames does not explicitly wherein said hub circuit (Ethernet hub) routes telephony information associated with telephony adapter to the first telephony device, and routes other telephony information to the at least one additional telephony device. However, in the same field of endeavor, Bhatia (6,118,768) discloses wherein said hub circuit (Ethernet hub, 340, fig.1) routes telephony information associated with telephony adapter to the first telephony device, and routes other telephony information to the at least one additional telephony device (fig.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to apply Bhatia's teaching to Eames' system with the motivation being to bi-directionally route digital on either or both B-channels of ISDN connection between PSTN and analog telephone devices.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9-9-5 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A/. Applicant argued that the combination of Eames (6,208,637) and Rogers (6,346,964) does not disclose "an expansion port to include a signal to carry information not associated with the one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter to a second broadband telephony adapter.

In reply, applicant is directed to figure 3 wherein there are 2 USAM 340, one is connected to the first adapter 1604 as shown in figure 16b, the other USAM 340 which has the same function connected to the second adapter (not shown), thus the expansion port 180 is connected to carry data to the second adapter (not shown) via the other USAM 340.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuongchau Ba Nguyen whose telephone number is 571–272–3148. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax

Application/Control Number: 09/469,987

Art Unit: 2665

Page 9

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

Phuongchau Ba Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2665

DUCHO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Suchestr-